DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 752 HE 022 526

AUTHOR Della-Dora, Delmo
TITLE The Impact of the Clinical Supervision Initiative on the Development of University Faculty Supervision Skills.
PUB DATE 27 Mar 89
NOTE 13p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Supervision; Supervisory Methods; Teacher Supervision; Workshops

ABSTRACT

A summary of the Far West Laboratory findings in regard to the impact of the clinical supervision initiative (CSI) on project faculty and non-project faculty in general is presented with some detail on how the project faculty and non-project faculty at the California State University (CSU) Hayward campus seem to have been affected by CSI. The major training efforts for faculty at CSU Hayward were conducted with single subject and multiple subject faculty. The training program took place every 3 to 4 weeks for 3 hours for each of the project's 3 years. Discussion sessions were heated but carried out in a manner in which each person's ideas were given attention and treated with respect. Findings of the Far West Laboratory include: as a group, enhanced project faculty participated in the CSI workshop to a greater extent than non-project faculty; enhanced project faculty reported a better comprehension of CSI than non-project faculty who received instruction; multiple subject and single subject university supervisors received clinical supervision instruction from multiple sources; and student teachers perceived that project faculty more frequently used CSI techniques than non-project faculty. A primary outcome of the enhanced supervision formula was the reported increase in quality of supervision enhanced project offered student teachers. At the conclusion of the study, there was impetus to continue the faculty's efforts in assisting each other with staff development in areas that both faculty and students thought were in greatest need of attention. Contains 7 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Impact of the Clinical Supervision Initiative on the Development of University Faculty Supervision Skills*

Delmo Della-Dora, Professor, School of Education
California State University, Hayward

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Delmo Della-Dora
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED308752

The following description includes (1) a summary of the Far West Laboratory findings and conclusions concerning the impact of the clinical supervision initiative on project faculty and non-project faculty in general and (2) some details of how the project faculty and non-project faculty at a partcular campus (CSU, Hayward) seem to have been affected by the initiative.

THE FAR WEST LABORATORY REPORT

Selected findings which appear in a report of the Far West Laboratory follow (Mata, et al; April, 1988):

> As a group, enhanced project faculty participated in the CSI [clinical supervision instruction] workshop to a greater extent than non-project faculty (p.21).
>
> Enhanced project faculty reported a better comprehension of clinical supervision than non-project faculty who received instruction . . . (p.22). ... enhanced project faculty were more likely than non-project faculty to report that they had a solid understanding of clinical supervision and could integrate those techniques into their supervision of student teachers (t-test, $p<.05$) (p.23).
>
> A primary outcome of the enhanced supervision formula was the reported increase in quality of supervision enhanced project offered student teachers. [Enhanced project faculty]... were more likely to meet with their student teachers prior to making an observation of their teaching ($p<.001$) than in the past. Second, they reported that they were more able to analyze observational data ($p<.05$) with their student teachers when under the enhanced supervision formula (pp.23-27).
>
> Enhanced project faculty reported that they conducted pre-observation activities more often than non-project faculty. ... enhanced project faculty reported that while they worked under the enhanced supervision formula they spent more time supervising, conferring with their student teachers before making an observation, and meeting with their student teachers. This pattern was more marked for those in multiple subject credential programs than for their single subject colleagues (p.27).
>
> Enhanced project faculty were more likely than non-project faculty to report that clinical supervision training elicited favorable recognition from Deans, colleagues and cooperating teachers (p.28).

*Prepared for presentation at the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, California on March 27, 1989.

HE 022 526

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Multiple subject and single subject university supervisors received clinical supervision instruction from multiple sources (p.33).

Multiple subject project faculty reported a higher level of understanding of clinical supervision than multiple subject non-project faculty. Differences between single subject project faculty and non-project faculty were much harder to detect (p.34).

... project faculty were more likely than non-project faculty to place greater importance on certain clinical supervision practices. ... university supervisors are much more committed to self-assessment and post-observation conferences than to pre-observation conference practices (pp.35-37).

When university supervisors placed importance on particular ... techniques, there was corresponding effort to use them ..., even though some of these techniques had been previously reported to be difficult to implement (p.37). Single subject project faculty... reported that they practiced pre-observation conference skills in reviewing lesson plans with their student teacher and identifying a focus for observation ($p<.05$). These skills had been previously identified as being particularly difficult to develop and implement (p.37).

Most university supervisors reported their supervision contributed to their student teachers' experience in basic training areas (e.g. classroom management, discipline and motivating students) (p.37).

Student teachers reported that project faculty were likely to place more emphasis on certain clinical supervision practices than non-project faculty although their perceptions were not as high as their university supervisor's reports (p.37).

Student teachers perceived that project faculty more frequently used clinical supervision techniques than non-project faculty (p.41).

Student teachers reported receiving the most assistance in curriculum development, evaluation and classroom organization. Despite identifying working with diverse populations as an area of difficulty for them, only a small proportion of student teachers indicated they received major assistance from university supervisors in this area (p.44).

The authors of the Far West Laboratory report make the following observations among their general summaries of these findings:

Enhanced project faculty, relative to non-project faculty, were more likely to thoroughly and consistently use clinical supervision techniques with their student teachers and were able to implement techniques they previously reported to be difficult. An unintended outcome of the enhanced supervision formula was that the stature of supervision was elevated, and enhanced project faculty gained favorable recognition from Deans and colleagues (p.30).

The effects of these workshops on single subject project faculty were moderate compared to their multiple subject colleagues who reported using clinical supervision techniques more often. This may be the result of the many differences inherent ...[between] multiple subject and single subject programs and the prospect that non-project faculty had received clinical supervision training elsewhere (p.39).

> [Student teachers]...consistently reported that project faculty used clinical supervision more often and offered more and varied assistance. Close examination of student teacher responses ... suggests that ... workshops achieved in some measure ...[their] intended impact of giving university supervisors more time to supervise their student teachers (p.44).

In the Final Report on the three year study Mata, et al, (June, 1988) point out that two of the major features of the experiment, "scholarships" for courses taken by cooperating teachers and "enhanced supervision" (fewer student teachers to supervise) could not be supported financially by the campuses but that many campuses thought that the "stipend program" could be funded with local resources (pp.33-34). (The stipend program paid teachers $225.00 to take 15 hours of clinical supervision training.)

Another conclusion related to supervision concerned "...the importance of a single approach to supervision within a credential program rather than the promotion of a uniform approach system-wide" (p.37). [Underscoring added.]

COMMENTARY ON THE FAR WEST LABORATORY REPORT

The staff of the Far West Laboratory was faced with a formidable task as it attempted to gather data and report results on a system-wide basis for campus activities which were extremely varied in their nature. In examining the impact of training and the "enhanced formula" (only half as many students to supervise) on university project faculty and non-project faculty there were the variables of:

> Differing definitions among the six campuses concerning the meaning of "clinical supervision". The six campuses did not attempt to develop a common definition of the term at any point but the Laboratory staff was able to identify a common set of practices, on an *ex post facto* basis through skillful questioning and careful investigation of practices.
>
> There were major differences in prior training in the skills/knowledge of clinical supervision among project faculty members and between project- and non-project faculty members. In some cases non-project faculty had already received extensive prior training in clinical supervision and/or had extensive prior experience in its use. There was also variation on particular campuses concerning the amount of clinical supervision training received by project faculty and non-project faculty. Awarding of grants was made on the basis

of proposals that training would be conducted for either single subject faculty or multiple subject faculty. However on the Hayward campus, and others as well, interested faculty members were allowed to participate in the training. It was difficult to clearly determine the impact of the funds provided by the initiative for clinical supervision training on project vs. non-project faculty because of differences in training and experience with clinical supervision on the part of project and non-project faculty both prior to - and during - the three years of the study.

Already noted in the Far West Laboratory reports were apparent differences in the impact of the initiative's efforts on Single Subject faculty and on Multiple Subject faculty. The authors indicate that this may be due to differences in the nature of the two types of programs. However, it is also possible that the difference in impact of the programs may be due to the nature of the people who choose to work at one level or the other (Della-Dora, 1960). More will be said about this later. However the finding does suggest the possibility that different kinds of approaches to training of university supervisors might be considered for Single Subject faculty as compared with Multiple Subject faculty.

The variation in competence for, and commitment to, supervision was not determined in the study. This is understandable because of the complexity of the issues involved and because of the kinds of associated problems that would attend any attempt to make such a determination. There was a tacit assumption that the range of competence for, and commitment to, supervision would be distributed in approximately the same manner among project and non-project faculty as well as between Multiple Subject faculty and Single Subject faculty. With the relatively small number of faculty involved in each setting however, there is certainly the possibilty of sufficiently unequal distributions in these two sets of characteristics among project and non-project faculty and/or between Multiple Subject and Single Subject faculty to significantly affect the results. For example, we can reasonably speculate that the faculty members who chose to participate in the training, despite the fact that they did not receive the benefits of a

reduced supervision load, were strongly committed to doing well in supervision. This commitment may have been significantly stronger than for some the faculty members who took part in the training only because they were automatically included in the grant awarded to their campus for either Single Subject faculty or Multiple Subject faculty.

The variables cited above provide some basis for questioning whether there are any valid conclusions that can be drawn. However, if we assume that the findings and conclusions of the Far West Laboratory are valid, to what can we attribute the apparent positive impact of the initiative on supervisory practices?

In the Far West Laboratory reports are descriptions of unique program features on each campus and of "unintended consequences" that appeared at some (if not all) campuses. The apparent positive impact of the initiative and some of the "unintended consequences" may have a common generating source. These two related issues are discussed after a brief examination of what occurred on the Hayward campus.

IMPACT OF THE CLINICAL SUPERVISION INITIATIVE ON THE FACULTY AT THE HAYWARD CAMPUS

The definition of "clinical supervision" used in the grant proposal from the Hayward campus originally included three major components: clinical supervision techniques as described by Keith Acheson and Meredith Gall (1980); "elements of effective instruction" as defined by Madeline Hunter and associates (1980) and teaching approaches compiled by Bruce Joyce and Marsha Weil in their book, "Models of Teaching" (1980). The definition of what was encompassed by "clinical supervision" evolved through discussions and decisions of the faculty over the three years of the study so that it came to include the 15 factors which are included in the Los Angeles County Schools' training program of "Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement" (Kerman, Kimball, and Martin, 1980). As the training series drew to a close in May of 1988, the Single Subject faculty members decided that clinical supervision training in the future should also focus strongly on ways to supervise which would help student teachers deal more effectively with cultural diversity and with helping their students with second language acquisition. These changes were among the several positive unanticipated consequences on faculty.

The major training efforts for faculty on the Hayward campus were conducted with Single Subject faculty (12-15 people) and interested Multiple Subject faculty (1-4 people) together. In addition, at least 8 faculty members (6 Multiple Subject and 2 Single Subject) took clinical supervision training with the cooperating teachers. (There was also a six hour training session for all faculty members of the Department of Teacher Education at the beginning of the second year, 1987-1988, and a three hour orientation sesssion for all new faculty members at the beginning of the third year.)

The major training program took place every 3-4 weeks for three hours for each of the three years of the grant. Some of the unanticipated positive consequences of this process were that (1) faculty members found it increasingly valuable to allocate time at each training session to discussion of issues of program operation, curriculum and philosophies undergirding instruction; (2) faculty found it helpful to observe each other supervising via vidotapes of them in conference with student teachers and/or by bringing in student teachers to the training sessions to demonstrate specific aspects of supervision.

The discussion sessions were often heated and interesting but carried out in a manner in which each person's ideas were given attention and treated with respect. There had never been a time previously in the history of operation of the Teacher Education when groups of faculty members had engaged in a series of prolonged, in-depth analyses of the curriculum and instructional aspects of Credential programs of the Department. This year there was follow up in that several faculty members who had expert knowledge in techniques of second language acquisition and others who had expert knowledge of ways of accomodating cultural diversity presented a three hour session to interested faculty. In this session the emphasis was on providing an overview of what could be learned if training were provided, with a subsequent questionnaire to faculty members to allow them to specify which of the items presented were of greatest interest. The "expert" faculty members will conduct training sessions in March, April and May in accordance with results of the opinionnaire. (Although Single Subject faculty generated these actions, the meetings this year are open to <u>all</u> faculty members.) The willingness of faculty members to learn from each other and to give time to doing so, without any material reward, was fostered by positive experiences garnered during the time of the clinical supervision training series.

This year we have also found that courses taught in the Single Subject program more often provide evidence of correlation and integration of subject matter than heretofore. The basic core course in the Credential Program and the subject matter methods seminars complement each other, for example, in that the variety of general strategies for teaching are introduced in the curriculum and instruction course and the ways to use them in each subject field are taught in the separate subject matter methods seminars.

Another unanticipated consequence is that at least four faculty members who participated in the clinical supervision training series are teaching new courses which came out of the activities developed from the initiative. The courses are now part of a "Certificate Program for Teachers As Leaders" which evolved from courses taught to cooperating teachers. Thus we have commitment to a new program which begins as an Extended Education offering but which may be used in part, or in whole, for our M.S. degree in the Curriculum Option.

The final major consequence to be noted is that Single Subject faculty members have been using the content of their training not only in supervision but in their own teaching. They report modeling a variety of teaching strategies and behaviors associated with high student achievement and they also instruct teacher candidates in their use. While this is a logical outcome of learning to observe for such items in supervising student teaching, there was no explicit expectation imposed on participants to either model the behaviors or to teach them and so it is gratifying to note that such has occurred.

The question of differences in program impact on Multiple Subject faculty as compared with Single Subject faculty was noted earlier. The question about differences in reactions and attitudes between these two groups has been a major topic of interest for curriculum specialists, staff developers and supervisors for at least 40 years. As a matter of fact it became the topic for a doctoral dissertation by this author who was, at that time, working as a curriculum consultant and wondering about the reasons for the significantly different attitudes and behaviors of groups of elementary teachers and secondary school teachers with whom he was engaged in cooperative curriculum study projects (Della-Dora, 1960). Colleagues in the field of curriculum development and staff development all agreed that there were distinctive differences in reactions of elementary school teachers and secondary

school teachers but attributed the differences to the organization of schools (departmentalized vs. self-contained classrooms) and/or to the age groups with which each worked and/or to the interest in teaching subject matter vs. interest in students as people. These views were that the environment of the school produced the kinds of teacher behaviors described previously.

The study is dated now but there is some reason to believe that its findings may still be valid because the nature of the forces at work in selection of level of teaching have not changed in ways which should materially affect the results. The major findings were that:

> Each level of teaching seems to attract people to it who have certain personality traits. Elementary schools tend to attract people who are more open to other people's ideas and who have more "progressive" educational values than do secondary schools.
>
> The differences noted do not seem to have been determined by the environment of the school, that is, the nature of the school organization or the structure of the school because these same differences in traits were found to the same degree among college juniors who had not yet taught a day (but had selected the level at which they would like to teach) as were found among experienced teachers. In the latter case the number of years of teaching experience did not alter the differences found between elementary and secondary school teachers.
>
> The greatest differences in these two personality traits found among levels of teaching was between teachers of the early elementary grades (K-3) and those teaching in senior high schools.
>
> Another significant difference found among elementary school teachers and secondary school teachers was that secondary school teachers tended to identify more with the professsion of their subject matter (chemistry teachers identifying with chemists) and elementary teachers tended to identify more with the profession of teaching.

The kinds of characteristics which were described in this study seem to suggest that secondary school teachers are more likely to prefer what we would now call "field

independent" kinds of approaches and elementary school teachers would tend to prefer "field dependent" approaches. Thus, training which emphasizes independence, individual initiative and attention to subject matter might be more successful with Single Subject faculty and approaches which emphasize group processes, interdependence and attention to learning characteristics of students might be more successful with Multiple Subject faculty.

The data from the Far West Laboratory study for the Hayward campus, are consistent with the findings and conclusions reported for the six "experimental campuses" as a group already reported. There was an improvement in university clinical supervision practices as perceived by both the Hayward university faculty and by the Hayward program student teachers who were supervised. In a Far West Laboratory report of January 6, 1988 to Arthurlene Towner, [then] Acting Dean of the Hayward campus School of Education contains a breakout of data which apply to Hayward only. The tables show that for Hayward's university supervisors: (1) changes in supervision practices reported by them were higher than those reported as the average at the six "experimental campuses"; (2) use of most of 15 clinical supervision practices was (self) reported as greater than that for the average of the "experimental campuses"; and (3) student teachers associated with the Hayward program found the frequency of use of clinical supervision by Hayward university supervisors to be greater than did student teachers, on the average, who were associated with the six experimental campuses (as a group).

Moreover, at the conclusion of the study there was impetus to continue the faculty's efforts in assisting each other with staff development in areas which both faculty and students thought were in greatest need of attention (teaching culturally diverse student populations and assisting with second language acquisition). Such training is being conducted this year, using the expert knowledge of specific Hayward faculty members.

The reasons for success are probably related to items cited earlier in the Far West Laboratory reports, namely, the recognition awarded to project participants by Deans and colleagues and "...the importance of a single approach to supervision within a credential program rather than the promotion of a uniform approach system-wide" (Mata, et al; April, 1988; p.37). The factor of recognition is one which accounts for apparent success in many educational ventures as has been well documented in the research literature over a long period of time. Another kind of

recognition is inherent in the initiative itself, in that project faculty had a reduced load for supervision - a factor which has long been recognized as being desirable.

The freedom for each campus to define clinical supervision in its own unique fashion is important to all university faculty - and perhaps even more so for Single Subject faculty who are likely to be more resistant to a uniform system-wide approach than are their Multiple Subject colleagues.

Most of the training sessions at Hayward were conducted by a member of the Single Subject faculty. This made it easier for individuals to express their own individual viewpoints and feel free to exercise independent judgment concerning ways of using what was being learned. Separate from the general sessions, faculty members could work with others in their own subject field for mutual critiques of supervision videotapes. It seems reasonable to conclude that these conditions permitted the predominating characteristics of Single Subject faculty (mentioned previously) to be well accomodated.

Whether the skills which were learned during the three years of training and the practices which were established for carrying out supervision of student teachers will persist remains in question. A recent survey of practices of former project and non-project faculty was conducted to shed some light on this issue. All of the 11 faculty members who had been part of the "project faculty" (and are still on campus) and 12 of the 14 faculty members who had been "non-project faculty" members responded (anonymously) concerning their supervision practices this year (1988-1989).

Project faculty reported using eight of the twelve elements of clinical supervision practices [which were the core of the Hayward campus training elements] more frequently this year than did non-project faculty. Those practices were: (1) conducting a pre-observation conference with student teachers; (2) using a style of conferencing appropriate to the needs of the student teacher at a given time (directive, collegial, facilitating); (3) gathering classroom observation information through use of ...at-task data; (4) observing for a "social family" model of teaching, such as "jigsaw" and "role playing"; (5) observing for the nonverbal factors that make up the Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement (TESA) model, such as

"proximity", "latency", and "listening"; (6) gathering classroom observation information through use of ... selective verbatim recording; (7) gathering classroom observation information through use of ...verbal flow data; and (8) gathering classrooom observation information through use of ...criterion referenced recording.

Project faculty and non-project faculty indicated similar frequency of use of four of the twelve Hayward program clinical supervision practices. These were: (1) conducting a post-observation conference; (2) observing for a behavioristic model of teaching, such as a "five step lesson" or direct teaching; (3) observing for an "information-processing" model of teaching such as "concept attainment" or "inquiry" lessons; and (4) observing for the Madeline Hunter type of "elements of instruction" such as elements of retention, of transfer, of practice. Item (1) has always been a part of supervision practices, even before the use of clinical supervision and items (2), (3) and (4) are now part of the curriculum of both the Single Subject and the Multiple Subject credential programs so it is not surprising that there should be little difference between the two groups in their use.

For six of the eight practices for which the [former] project faculty members reported higher frequency of use than the non-project faculty, usage by project faculty this year ranged from 90 - 100 per cent. Thus frequency of use remains high this year despite lack of an enhanced supervision formula for student teaching.

It is not surprising that there would be some carry over during this year because many faculty members have been using the newer practices for up to three years and are pleased with the results. However the practical realities of time needed for use of the clinical supervision practices which were part of the Hayward training program are more likely to outweigh the best of intentions and desires in the future.

REFERENCES

Acheson, Keith A. and Gall, Meredith D. Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Preservice and Inservice Applications. New York: Longman, 1980

Della-Dora, Delmo. "A Comparison of the Personality of Elementary School Teachers and Secondary School Teachers". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1960.

Hunter, Madeline. Improved Instruction. El Segundo, CA.: TIP Publications, 1980.

Joyce, Bruce and Weil, Marsha. Models of Teaching (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980.

Kerman, Sam, et al. Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement: Coordinator Manual. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1980.

Mata, Susana C., et al. "Year Three Evaluation: Volume VI, The Impact of the Clinical Supervision Initiative on Specially Funded Credential Programs". San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, April, 1988.

Mata, Susana C., et al. "Final Report: Improvement of Preservice Teacher Education Through Clinical Supervision of Student Teachers". San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, June, 1988.